



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,304	02/24/2004	Shinji Uchida	SHO-0064	8300

23353 7590 08/23/2005

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
LION BUILDING  
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/784,304

Applicant(s)

UCHIDA

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-19-2005
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9, 10, 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10/3, 10/4 is/are ~~allowed~~ objected to.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9, 10/1, 10/2, 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Title objected to, terms "electrical connectors" and "shutters" should be used.

Claim 5 objected to, line 2, "a shell for... housing;" should be deleted since it ~~respects~~ <sup>repeats</sup> claim 1 terms.

1. Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Germany 801 in view of Minds, Wu and Nagata.

2. Germany and Minds are applied as in ~~last~~ <sup>last</sup> office action. Germany socket 20 (with Minds) meet claim 1 features except for a "shell covering the socket and covering a front face of the socket" and a shutter in the form of a "flat board".

3. Wu, figures 1 and 4 at 3 and Nagata, figures 8 and 10 at 45 disclose shield cases <sup>(shells)</sup> like that recited, the Nagata shield noted to help retain the shutter. Nagata at 5, figures 10, 12 and 15, discloses a shutter in form of a flat plate. Obvious to use these type feature in Germany device. The shield would protect the connector from disturbances and the flat shutter would enable lower cost.

4. Even without other references, the formation of Germany shutter 30 as a flat plate would only be an obvious matter of ~~signification~~ <sup>simplification</sup> of the item. Claims 2-5 met by above combination with use of soldering tabs in view of Wu. Claims 8-9 define obvious variation. None of claims 2-5, 8-9 are seen to be subject to "specific arguments" in the Remarks and should stand or fall with claim 1.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anyone of Germany 801 or Brickett.

Art Unit: 2839

6. See last office action. Claim 11 is to "A plug" usable with a type of receptacle and not to specifics of the receptacle, therefore reference plugs meet claim language.

7. Claims 1, 2, 10/1 and 10/2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickett in view of Kameda, Kostich and Nagata.

8. Brickett discloses connector 12 (figures 1 and 3) with in line contacts 14, shutter 20 and spring 22. Brikett does not <sup>disclose shutter to be</sup> insulative or formed as flat member perpendicular to plug direction or use of a shell. <sup>^</sup> Use of insulation for shutter taught by Kostich at 5, 14. Use of flat plate defines obvious variation producing no unexpected result and also suggested by Nagata at 5. Also obvious to use a shell in view of Nagata at 45, figure 9 for protection of the connector. For claim 10, Brickett plug has header 36 and a shutter 38 but lacks a frame to store the shutter. Kameda includes such a type frame at 20. Obvious to use such a frame on Brickett plug 36 to help guide shutter 38 as it retracts.

9. Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.


10. For claim 1, use of shell and flat plate shutter are suggested by newly recited reference Nagata and in addition, flat plate shutter produces no new result and use of shells is very well known in the art. For page 5, lines 21-23 <sup>argument</sup> use of "bezels 42a, 42b to <sup>^</sup> retain shutter" are not recited in claims and arguments to such function cannot avoid the rejection.

11. For claim 10, no arguments are specifically applied and therefore the claim should stand or fall with claim 1.

Art Unit: 2839

12. Claims 10/3 and 10/4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322